



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/561,012

12/11/2006

Jorge Abellan Sevilla

526801-57PUS

6077

27799

7590

02/11/2011

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP
551 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 1210
NEW YORK, NY 10176

EXAMINER

MAHMOOD, REZWANUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/11/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/561,012	Applicant(s) ABELLAN SEVILLA ET AL.	
	Examiner REZWANUL MAHMOOD	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4,6-8,10 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4,6-8,10 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the communication filed on 08/11/10 and the communication filed on 01/21/11. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, and 11 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument in the response filed in 01/21/11 regarding the Casey reference being invalid is persuasive. Therefore, the last office action has been withdrawn. In the current action, the arguments filed on 08/11/10 have again been considered but are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection using the prior art Durga (US Patent 6,813,498) used in the prosecution of the Casey application, the latter inadvertently used as prior art by the examiner instead of the former in the last office action. The current response is a Final rejection necessitated by the amendments filed in applicant's response in 08/11/10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kruglikov (US Patent 6,505,215) in view of Durga (US Patent 6,813,498) in view of Guthery (US Patent 6,824,064) and in further view of Mwaura (US

Art Unit: 2164

Patent 6,779,002).

With respect to claim 10, Kruglikov discloses a computer-implemented method for synchronizing, through a network, a first database that is stored in a mobile first data processing system and a second database stored in a second data processing system (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Col 2, lines 22-43; Fig 1), the method comprising:

an application in the mobile first data processing system, the application being configured to request that the mobile first data processing system start a synchronization process of the first database with the second database according to a synchronization policy (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Column 5, lines 2-13; Figure 1);

executing the application (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 5, lines 2-13; Figure 1);

initiating, by the mobile first data processing system, the synchronization process of the first and second databases in response to receiving the command (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 5, lines 2-13; Figure 1).

However, Kruglikov does not explicitly disclose:

the application configured to remotely request that a mobile data processing system start a process and receiving a remote command.

The Durga reference discloses a programming stored in a mobile unit configured to remotely start a process and receiving remote instructions (Durga: Column 2, lines 1-19; Column 7, lines 38-45; Column 8, lines 30-41; Figures 1, 3, and 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Kruglikov with the teachings of Durga for the application to be configured to remotely request that the mobile first data processing system start a synchronization process and initiating, by the mobile first data processing system, the synchronization process of the first and second databases in response to receiving the remote command for detection and recovery of missing wireless devices in communication systems (Durga: Column 1, lines 56-58).

However, Kruglikov and Durga do not explicitly disclose:

a security token coupled to the mobile first data processing device, loading the application in the security token;

The Guthery reference discloses a security token is coupled for communication with the mobile first data processing system and an application is loaded into the security token (Guthery: Abstract, lines 1-7; Column 2, lines 1-14 and 51-57; Column 4, lines 25-29; Column 7, lines 33-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Kruglikov and Durga with the teachings of Guthery to have a data processing system include a security token controlled by an operator and load an application into the security token to move the administration of simultaneous communication with multiple applications on a smart card onto the smart card itself (Guthery: Column 3, lines 19-22).

Kruglikov, Durga, and Guthery do not explicitly disclose:

receiving, by the application, messages or events that occur in the mobile first

Art Unit: 2164

data processing system or in the network;

in response to the messages or events received and in accordance with the synchronization policy, concluding by the application, whether a synchronization of the first and second databases is needed, and

if a synchronization is needed, transmitting, by the application, a command to the mobile first data processing system that informs the mobile first data processing system that a new synchronization is requested, said command providing the mobile first data processing system with information about synchronization parameters for use in synchronizing content of the first and second databases;

The Mwaura reference, however, discloses receiving a message by an application and concluding if synchronization is needed by checking if the message is relevant, if it is relevant then taking a synchronization action (Mwaura: Abstract, lines 1-29; Column 6, lines 20-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Kruglikov, Durga, and Guthery with the teachings of Mwaura to conclude if synchronization is needed, transmitting a command to take the designated synchronization action upon the message for synchronizing content of the first and second databases for providing a means to synchronize data between different databases (Mwaura: Column 1, lines 7-9).

With respect to claim 2, Kruglikov in view of Durga in view of Guthery and in further view of Mwaura discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the

Art Unit: 2164

information includes an identifier of the second database to be synchronized (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Column 5, lines 2-13; Fig 1).

With respect to claim 3, Kruglikov in view of Durga in view of Guthery and in further view of Mwaura discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the information includes a synchronization protocol to be used between the first and second data processing systems (Kruglikov: Col 6, lines 33-36; Guthery: Col 8, lines 15-20).

With respect to claim 4, Kruglikov in view of Durga in view of Guthery and in further view of Mwaura discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the information includes an identifier of the first database (Kruglikov: Column 2, lines 58-67; Column 3, lines 1-11; Mwaura: Abstract, lines 1-29; Column 6, lines 20-38).

With respect to claim 6, Kruglikov in view of Durga in view of Guthery and in further view of Mwaura discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the application is informed of a synchronization result between the first and second databases (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1; Guthery' 64: Abstract, lines 1-7; Column 2, lines 1-14 and 51-57; Column 4, lines 25-29; Column 7, lines 33-35; Mwaura: Abstract, lines 1-29; Col 6, lines 20-38).

With respect to claim 7, Kruglikov in view of Durga in view of Guthery and in

Art Unit: 2164

further view of Mwaura discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the application is informed of a synchronization result if the synchronization result was requested in the command (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1; Mwaura: Abstract, lines 1-29; Column 6, lines 20-38).

With respect to claim 11, Kruglikov in view of Durga in view of Guthery and in further view of Mwaura discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the mobile first data processing equipment executes a program configured to receive all of the synchronization parameters and to start the synchronization process (Kruglikov: Abstract, lines 1-15; Column 2, lines 22-43; Column 4, lines 14-24; Figure 1; Guthery: Abstract, lines 1-7; Column 2, lines 1-14 and 51-57; Column 4, lines 25-29; Column 7, lines 33-35; Mwaura: Abstract, lines 1-29; Column 6, lines 20-38).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kruglikov in view of Durga in view of Guthery ('64) in further view of Mwaura as applied to claims 10, 2-4, 6, and 7 above, and further in view of Guthery (US Patent 6,676,022), hereinafter referred to as Guthery ('22).

With respect to claim 8, Kruglikov in view of Durga in view of Guthery ('64) in further view of Mwaura discloses the method according to claim 10,

However, Kruglikov, Durga, Guthery and Mwaura do not explicitly disclose the command is a card application toolkit command.

The Guthery ('22) reference discloses a card application toolkit providing mechanisms that allow applications existing in the smart card to interact and operate (US (Guthery '22: Column 4, lines 41-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Kruglikov, Durga, Guthery ('64), and Mwaura with the teachings of Guthery ('22) for a command being a card application toolkit command for processing commands in a smart card (Guthery '22: Column 2, lines 62-63).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REZWANUL MAHMOOD whose telephone number is (571)272-5625. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 10 A.M. - 5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571)272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 2164

February 8, 2011

/Charles Rones/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164